REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

REQUEST FOR CONTINUED EXAMINATION (RCE)

In response to the Final Action of August 17, 2005, Applicant encloses a Request for Continuing Examination together with the prescribed fee.

The submissions supporting the request are set out below. Accordingly, the enclosed RCE fully complies with 37 CFR 1.114 and therefore asks that the finality of the last report be withdrawn and the following submissions be fully considered.

Submissions

The claims have been amended to clearly distinguish the present invention from the cited art. In particular, independent claim 1 has been deleted and newly presented independent claim 39 re-casts the definition of the printer/display device to focus directly on the inventive aspects. Accordingly, the amendments do not introduce any new matter.

Claims – Typographical Error

The objection relating to the typographical error identified by the Examiner is now moot in view of the cancellation of claim 1.

Claims – Obviousness

Claim 1 stands rejected as obvious in light of US 5,752,049 to Lee in view of US 6,188,569 to Minemoto et al. Claim 1 also stands rejected as obvious in light of JP 08267854 to Kashiwa in view of US 6,508,552 to Steinfield et al.

Claim 1 has been deleted in favor a fresh definition of the invention set out in newly presented claim 39. Claim 39 clearly lists the combination of elements that provide the printing and display device with a much smaller footprint without sacrificing any functionality of conventional computer and printer systems.

Incorporating a flat panel display and a pagewidth inkjet printhead into a single housing so that the plane of the media feed path is positioned behind that of the flat screen provides a single device that is effectively the same size as the display alone. The outer casing is marginally bigger than that of a flat panel display, but more importantly, the footprint of the device on the user's desk is a fraction of a separate display and printer. Traditionally, the footprint of a stand-alone printer will often preclude it from the user's desk. Therefore, the user needs to leave their workstation to retrieve printouts. The present invention delivers hard copies directly onto the desk in front of the user.

The data connection hub connects the device to a computer and a separate data receiving device so that the user can download files to a memory stick, CD burner or similar without moving to a remote computer.

As the printhead is pagewidth, it avoids jolting or jarring the display as would be the case with a reciprocating printhead. It will be appreciated that shaking or moving the display can disrupt the user's view of the screen.

The Lee disclosure incorporates a printer, CRT display into a desktop computer for user convenience. This disclosure is essentially integrating the peripheral devices into the box housing the computer. Lee acknowledges that printers have previously been combined with printers but the resulting devices had low power efficiency. Lee uses a power save or sleep mode for the printer which is only activated when the computer send it a print job.

Minemoto also integrates a display into the computer.

Neither of the documents recognize that the computer does not need to clutter the user's work area. Consequently, both the cited devices are fundamentally computers with one or more integrated peripherals. Therefore, Lee does not provide any incentive to remove the computer and CRT screen from the device, and install the flat panel display of Minemoto instead.

In contrast, present invention realizes that users interact directly with the peripheral devices, not the processor of the computer. The printing and display device of the present invention allows interaction with the processor through the display, data connection hub and inbuilt printer. The upright media feed path positioned behind the screen means that the outer casing is only slightly larger than that of existing flat panel displays and the footprint is a fraction of the combined footprints of a separate display and printer or computer.

From the above, the combined disclosures of the cited documents fail to teach several of the elements defined in new claim 39. Accordingly they do not support an obviousness rejection under 35 USC§103.

Likewise, the combination of Kashiwa and Steinfield do now teach all the elements of new claim 39. In Kashiwa the flat panel display 2 and the printer 9 are in different outer casings (3 and 6 respectively). The micro-processor 8 is in the same outer casing 6 as the printer 9. There is no disclosure of a data connection hub to receive print and display data from an eternal computer. Kashiwa, like Lee, is simply a computer with integrated printer. These element are also lacking in Steinfield. There is no suggestion of a stand alone printing and display device as defined by new claim 39.

From the above, the cited documents fail to render new claim 39 obvious. As the appended claims incorporate the features of new claim 39, they are likewise non-obvious in light of the prior art.

We respectfully submit that the Examiner's rejections have been successfully traversed. The Applicant believes that the application is now in condition for allowance and favorable reconsideration is courteously solicited.

Very respectfully,

Applicant: 

KIA SILVERBROOK

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762